



Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2018-2020

The format for reports on the implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) for the period 2018-2020 was approved by the 7th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP7, 4-8 December 2018, Durban, South Africa) through Resolution 7.1 and modified by the Standing Committee at its 15th meeting (11-13 December 2019, Bristol, UK) as mandated by the MOP. This format has been compiled following the AEWA Annex 3 (Action Plan), the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 and resolutions of the MOP.

In accordance with article V(c) of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, each Party shall prepare to each ordinary session of the MOP a National Report on its implementation of the Agreement and submit that report to the Agreement Secretariat. By Resolution 7.1 of the MOP the deadline for submission of National Reports to the 8th Session of the MOP was set at 180 days before the opening date of MOP8, which was scheduled to take place on 5-9 October 2021 in Hungary; therefore the deadline for submission of National Reports was Thursday 8 April 2021.

As per Resolution 7.1 of the MOP, Chapter 3 of the National Report Format for MOP8 reports was developed as a stand-alone online reporting module, which was administered through a separate reporting process on the population status of AEWA-listed (native) and non-native species of waterbirds for the period 2013-2018. This reporting process was concluded on 30 June 2020 as agreed by MOP7. Therefore, this report does not contain Chapter 3.

The AEWA National Reports 2018-2020 were compiled and submitted through the AEWA Online National Reporting System, which is part of the broader CMS Family Online Reporting System. The CMS Family Online Reporting System was developed by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in close collaboration with and under the guidance of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat.

1. General Information

Name of reporting Contracting Party

>>> Croatia

Date of entry into force of AEWA in the Contracting Party

>>> 01.09.2000

List any reservations that the Contracting Party has made (if any) in respect of any population(s) listed in Table 1 of Annex 3 or any specific provision of the AEWA Action Plan - either upon deposition of its instruments of accession (per AEWA, Article XV) or subsequent to any amendment of Table 1 or the AEWA Action Plan, as adopted by a session of the Agreement's Meeting of the Parties (per AEWA, Article X.6).

EU member states should list also all reservations entered by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union.

>>> For the Republic of Croatia as the EU Member State the reservation submitted by the European Commission on 22 March 2019 regarding nine AEWA species is relevant. The species under reservation are: The Common Eider (*Somateria mollissima*), the Red-breasted Merganser (*Mergus serrator*), the Common Pochard (*Aythya farina*), the Eurasian Oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*), the Northern Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*), the Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*), the Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*), the Red Knot (*Calidris canutus*) and the Spotted Redshank (*Tringa erythropus*).

2. Institutional Information

Please update information on the National AEWA Administrative Authority, the National Focal Points, the Designated National Respondent and the other contributors to this report.

Designated National AEWA Administrative Authority

Full name of the institution

>>> Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development

Name and title of the head of institution

>>> Mr. Tomislav Ćorić, minister

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Radnička cesta 80

P.O.Box

>>> n/a

Postal code

>>> HR-10000

City

>>> Zagreb

Country

>>> Croatia

Telephone

>>> +385 1 3717 175

Fax

>>> +385 1 3717 149

E-mail

>>> ministar@mingor.hr

Website

>>> <https://gospodarstvo.gov.hr/>

Designated National Focal Point (NFP) for AEWA matters

Name and title of the NFP

>>> Ms. Ivana Jelenić, Head of the Sector for Biodiversity and Strategic Affairs

Affiliation (institution, department)

>>> Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Nature Protection Directorate, Sector for Biodiversity and Strategic Affairs

Mailing address - Street and number

>>> Radnička cesta 80

P.O.Box

>>> n/a

Postal code

>>> HR-10000

City

>>> Zagreb

Country

>>> Croatia

Telephone

>>> +385 1 4866 122

Fax
>>> +385 1 4866 100

E-mail
>>> ivana.jelenic@mingor.hr

Website
>>> <https://gospodarstvo.gov.hr/kontakti-194/uprava-za-zastitu-prirode/211>

Designated National Focal Point for AEWA Technical Committee (TC NFP) matters

Name and title of the TC NFP
>>> Dr. Jelena Kralj, Scientific Assistant

Affiliation (institution, department)
>>> Institute of Ornithology, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Mailing address - Street and number
>>> Gunduliceva 24

P.O.Box
>>> n/a

Postal code
>>> HR-10000

City
>>> Zagreb

Country
>>> Croatia

Telephone
>>> +385 1 4825 401

Fax
>>> +385 1 4825 392

E-mail
>>> zzo@hazu.hr

Website
>>> http://info.hazu.hr/zavod_za_ornitologiju

Designated National Focal Point for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA NFP) matters

Name and title of the CEPA NFP
>>> CEPA NFP has not been designated

Affiliation (institution, department)
>>> -

Mailing address - Street and number
>>> -

P.O.Box
>>> -

Postal code
>>> -

City
>>> -

Country

>>> -

Telephone

>>> -

Fax

>>> -

E-mail

>>> -

Website

>>> -

Designated National Respondent (DNR) in charge of the compilation and submission of the AEWA National Report 2018-2020

Please select from the list below as appropriate.

The National Focal Point (NFP) has been designated as the National Respondent

Other contributors to the AEWA National Report 2018-2020

Please list the names and affiliations (institution, organisation) of the other contributors to this report. For Contracting Parties in which nature conservation is not an exclusive competence of national/federal government, Designated National Respondents are encouraged to seek input from other relevant levels of government.

- >>> 1. Vlatka Dumbović-Mazal, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Institute for Environmental and Nature Protection
- 2. Lea Barić, Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate for Forestry, Hunting and Wood Industry
- 3. Jelena Kralj, PhD, Institute of Ornithology
- 4. Vladimir Savić, PhD, Poultry Centre of the Croatian Veterinary Institute

Pressures and Responses

4. Species Conservation

4.1 Legal Measures

1. Following MOP7, was a review undertaken in your country of the relevant domestic legislation against the provisions of the latest version of the Agreement text and its annexes, including Table 1 in Annex III, taking into account all amendments adopted by MOP7? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1 (a), 1.1 (b), 2.2(a) and 2.2(b))

Yes

Please indicate the outcome of this review

Relevant national legislation was not fully in line with the Agreement text and its annexes

Please describe the discrepancies that were identified.

>>> Due to the listing of the Central & NE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean population of the Aythya ferina (Common Pochard) as 1b in Column A of the Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan there was a need to adjust hunting legislation because this species was a game species in Croatia with a closed season from 1 February until 31 August according to the Ordinance of the closed hunting season (OG 67/10, 87/10, 97/13, 44/17 and 34/18). In order to ban the hunting on the Aythya ferina in September 2019 the Ministry of Agriculture adopted the new Ordinance of the closed hunting season (OG 94/19) where hunting on the Aythya ferina is closed for the whole year (from 1st January until 31st December).

Please indicate whether the relevant domestic legislation was subsequently adjusted to be in line with the Agreement text and its annexes

Relevant national legislation was adjusted and is now in line with the Agreement text and its annexes. Please describe what piece(s) of legislation was adjusted.

>>> According to the Ordinance of the closed hunting season (OG 94/19) hunting season is closed from 1st January to 31st December.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

2. Was your country's national legislation reviewed following the Guidance on Measures in National Legislation for Different Populations of the Same Species, Particularly with Respect to Hunting and Trade (Resolution 6.7)?

See Appendix 1 / Appendix 2 / Appendix 3

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Did this require adjusting your national legislation?

No

Please describe how your current national legislation is compatible with the advice provided in the Guidance

>>> The only species with populations overlap in Croatia that is listed as a game species according to the national legislation is the Mallard (Anas platyrhynchos). In Croatia, W Mediterranean wintering population (column C category 1) overlaps with Black Sea-E Mediterranean wintering population (column B category 2c). However, national legislation applies measures that correspond to the provisions for column B populations universally for all game species.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

3. Please confirm the protection status under your country's national legislation of the AEWA Table 1, Column A populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name. (**Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)

2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;

3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

I confirm that I have downloaded the Excel file with my country's name, filled it in as necessary and uploaded the completed file as an attachment to this question.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Croatia_Q3_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColA.xlsx](#)

4. Please confirm whether there is an open hunting season for the AEWA Table 1, Column A, category 2 or 3 with an asterisk or category 4 populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name. (**Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)

2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;

3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

I confirm that I have downloaded the Excel file with my country's name, filled it in as necessary and uploaded the completed file as an attachment to this question.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Croatia_Q4_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColA-Cat2_3_4.xlsx](#)

5. Please confirm whether taking is regulated for the AEWA Table 1, Column B populations that are regularly occurring in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1).

Guidance on responding to this question:

1- Please click here and download the Excel file starting with your country's name. (**Notice:** before clicking on this hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.)

2- Fill in the Excel template comprehensively;

3- Upload the completed Excel file as an attachment here. For uploading please click on the little blue icon below containing a paper clip.

I confirm that I have downloaded the Excel file with my country's name, filled it in as necessary and uploaded the completed file as an attachment to this question.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[Croatia_Q5_AEWA_NR_2018-2020_PopColB.xlsx](#)

6. Please indicate if any of the following modes of taking are prohibited in your country: snares, limes, hooks, live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys, tape recorders and other electronic devices, electrocuting devices, artificial light sources, mirrors and other dazzling devices, devices for illuminating targets, sighting devices for night shooting comprising an electronic image magnifier or image converter, explosives, nets, traps, poison, poisoned or anesthetic baits, semi-automatic or automatic weapons with a magazine capable of holding more than two rounds of ammunition, hunting from aircraft, motor vehicles, or boats driven at a speed exceeding 5 km p/h (18 km p/h on the open sea), other non-selective modes of taking. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

Yes, one or more modes of taking have been prohibited

Please provide details to each mode of taking in the list below:

Snares

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Limes

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Hooks

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Live birds which are blind or mutilated used as decoys

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Tape recorders and other electronic devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Electrocuting devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Artificial light sources

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Mirrors and other dazzling devices

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Devices for illuminating targets

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Sighting devices for night shooting comprising an electronic image magnifier or image converter

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Explosives

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Nets

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Traps

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Poison

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Poisoned or anaesthetic baits

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Semi-automatic or automatic weapons with a magazine capable of holding more than two rounds of ammunition

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Hunting from aircraft, motor vehicles, or boats driven at a speed exceeding 5 km p/h (18 km p/h on the open sea)

Yes, fully

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

Other non-selective modes of taking

Yes, fully

Please specify which other non-selective modes of taking have been prohibited

>>> Crossbows and gassing or smoking out

Please indicate the legislation under which the mode of taking is prohibited

>>> Nature Protection Act (OG (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20)

If one or more non-selective modes of taking have not been prohibited, please explain the reasons

>>> -

7. Has your country granted exemptions from any of the above prohibitions in order to accommodate livelihoods uses? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.2(b); AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

No

8. Were any exemptions granted to the prohibitions required by paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the AEWA Action Plan? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.1.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 1.1)

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide information on each species for which exemption was granted

Croatia

Exemption for Audouin's Gull / *Larus audouinii*

Purpose of exemption (from the AEWA Action Plan)

(c) For the purpose of research and education, of re-establishment and for the breeding necessary for these purposes

Number of individuals for which exemption was granted

>>> 29

Number of eggs for which exemption was granted

>>> -

Territorial coverage of the exemption

Guidance: Name the territory(ies) covered by the exemption

>>> Islands of Lastovo, Mljet, Korcula and Peljesac

Time span of the exemption

Guidance: indicate the period for which the exemption is/was valid

>>> 3 May - 1 August 2018 and 15 May 2019 -15 May 2021

Year when the exemption was granted

>>> There were two exemptions, the first one was granted in 2018 and the second one in 2019

Additional information on this exemption (alternatively provide a web link or attach a file)

>>> -

9. Has a review of enforcement of and compliance with the domestic legislation relevant for AEWA implementation, [in particular the legislation which caters for the obligations under paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan], been undertaken in your country after MOP7? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.1(c) and 2.2(c))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Although the specific review of enforcement of and compliance with the domestic legislation was not made, several activities were undertaken that are relevant for enforcement and compliance with national legislation. In April 2019 the State Inspectorate was established and started to be operational. The nature protection inspection and the hunting inspection are since then part of the State Inspectorate. Establishment of the State Inspectorate was a step forward to improve management and conditions for performing inspection activities. In September 2019 the Ministry of Agriculture adopted the new Ordinance of the closed hunting season (OG 94/19) where hunting on the Aythya ferina (Common Pochard) is closed for whole year (from 1 January until 31 December) as a response to new listing of the Central & NE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean population of the Aythya ferina as 1b in Column A of the Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan.

Was a review undertaken before MOP7?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Due to lack of financial and administrative capacities.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Also, the Croatian BirdLife partner Biom is the associated beneficiary on the project LIFE Against Bird Crime (2018- 2022). This information, communication and awareness raising project aims to expand and improve public and community knowledge on illegal killing of birds, so as to stimulate public demand to stop illegal killing of birds. One of the goals of the project is also to build the capacity of institutional stakeholders key for ending illegal killing of birds. Through the project, Biom advocates that the government needs to strategically tackle this threat for birds, for example through creating a National action plan to end illegal killing of birds. Among focal species in Croatia are the Ferruginous Duck (Aythya nyroca), the Coot (Fulica atra), and focal areas are Neretva Delta and extensive carp fishponds.

10. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Not Applicable

Please explain.

>>> Croatian legislation is aligned with relevant EU directives, e.g. the Birds Directive and the Habitats Directive and it also takes into account obligations arising from international treaties to which Croatia is a party. Although Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats were not used per se, its principles are used in the process of preparation and implementation

of national nature protection legislation.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.1. Legal Measures

>>> No additional information.

4.2. Species Action and Management Plans

11. Please report on the progress of turning the International Single Species Action and Management Plans (ISSAP and ISSMP), as well as International Multi-species Action Plans (IMSAP), listed below, into National Action or Management Plans. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.2; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.2 (d))

Please report on all listed ISSAP, ISSMP and IMSAP

Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca* National Plan for Ferruginous Duck / *Aythya nyroca*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> It is a strictly protected species throughout the entire country according to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and the Ordinance of strictly protected species (OG 144/13 and 73/16). All important breeding sites are on carp fishponds that are designated as Natura 2000 sites. The most important site – Crna Mlaka is designated also as the Ramsar site and is protected as ornithological reserve according to the Nature Protection Act. Available human resources and funds were allocated in the development and implementation of specific conservation actions already recognized and defined in ISSAP.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> All key sites for the species were identified and designated as sites of the Natura 2000 (SPAs), including the ornithological reserve Crna Mlaka as the most important site for this species. According to the Nature Protection Act in ornithological reserve Crna Mlaka hunting is forbidden. On other carp fishponds that are included in the ecological network Natura 2000, projects and plans can be approved only after appropriate assessment has been conducted. Legal protection for Ferruginous Duck including the general protection of its habitat outside of protected areas was provided. Information about conservation of the Ferruginous Duck and its habitat was communicated to relevant policy makers and interest groups (e.g. hunters, fishermen, site managers). Management activities to regulate human activities at key sites, with special regard to fishing and boating, to reduce causes of disturbance and direct mortality, and increase breeding success were implemented on the key sites. National financial subsidy for 'wise use' of fishponds and incentives for maintaining/ reverting to extensive fishpond management is available and used on all key sites for the species. The use of lead shot for hunting over wetlands is banned. Most of the key sites are monitored annually during the winter International Waterbird Census.

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Moderate implementation – some of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the lower degree of implementation.

>>> Main reason is lack of administrative and financial resources, especially for wardening of key sites and enforcement of hunting regulations. Some foreseen activities are irrelevant, as the control and eradication of the Grass Carp, as the Ferruginous Duck is breeding almost exclusively at carp fishponds where the Grass Carp is among the most numerous species. Not all Natura 2000 sites important for birds (SPAs) have management plans. Public awareness schemes to promote conservation of the Ferruginous Duck and its habitat and circulation of this information to relevant policymakers, interest groups (e.g. hunters, fishermen, reserve managers) and local people was not implemented. Strict spatial and temporal hunting regulations that reduce the probability of hunting mortality were not promoted. A system to monitor fishing bycatch and fishing activity in relation to Ferruginous Duck distribution was not introduced. Most of the key sites are not adequately monitored annually during the passage and the breeding season. Specific research to study migratory movements, factors affecting survival and reproductive rates, habitat requirements and feeding ecology were not implemented.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

Corncrake / *Crex crex* National Plan for Corncrake / *Crex crex*

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Corncrake is endangered species in Croatia (IUCN category VU, in 2013) and strictly protected throughout the entire country according to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and the Ordinance of strictly protected species (OG 144/13 and 73/16). Available human resources and funds were allocated in the development and implementation of specific conservation actions recognized and defined in ISSAP. Since some actions for its conservation are implemented, development of action plan is not a priority.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> Species is legally protected. Habitat requirements of the species in management of protected areas is being taken into account. All key sites for the species were identified and designated as Natura 2000 sites (SPAs). National legislation requires the Appropriate Assessment and even the Environmental Impact Assessment preceding activities which could damage breeding habitat in Corncrake key areas, especially in the case of drainage, building of reservoirs, motorway projects, other infrastructure developments, afforestation, and conversion of permanent grassland into arable cultivation, regardless of the size of the project. Farmers are provided with information on corncrake-friendly mowing and habitat management techniques (e.g. no reseeding or fertilizing the grasslands) in Corncrake key areas. Bird hunting on one key site is prohibited with aim of reducing mortality due to bycatch. Grasslands in key sites are declared as permanent, and ploughing is not allowed. Standardised annual monitoring programme and national surveys are established. Research to evaluate the effect of conservation measures by comparing trends in different management regimes is being implemented.

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Advanced implementation - most of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of implementation.

>>> Majority of activities are implemented on national level and tackle the most known threats to the species.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

Great Snipe / Gallinago media National Plan for Great Snipe / Gallinago media

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> Great Snipe is an irregular species in Croatia during migration. There were no identified sites that would be regularly used by this species. However, Great Snipe is strictly protected throughout the entire country according to the Ordinance of strictly protected species (OG 144/13 and 73/16). Furthermore, according to the Ordinance on closed hunting season (OG 94/19) hunting of look-alike Common Snipe (*Gallinago gallinago*) is forbidden in the period from 1st February to 15th October, covering also pre-nuptial migration of the Great Snipe. This ordinance applies for the whole territory of Croatia.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

Black-tailed Godwit / Limosa limosa National Plan for Black-tailed Godwit / Limosa limosa

No NP and no action implemented

Please explain the reasons

>>> It is a regular passage bird, although always present in low numbers (usually up to few dozen birds). Therefore, there were no important stopover sites identified. It is not a strictly protected species, nor a game species. The species and its habitat are protected by the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19).

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

Eurasian Spoonbill / Platalea leucorodia

National Plan for Eurasian Spoonbill / Platalea leucorodia

No NP, but actions implemented

Please explain the reasons for having no NP in place

>>> Eurasian Spoonbill is a strictly protected species throughout the entire country according to the Ordinance of strictly protected species (OG 144/13 and 73/16). Since some actions for its conservation are implemented, development of an action plan is not considered as a priority.

Please provide a description of the actions implemented

>>> All colonies are designated as Natura 2000 sites (SPAs). Basic conservation measures were defined in the Ordinance on conservation objectives and conservation measures for birds in Natura 2000 sites (OG 15/14) and are now defined in new Ordinance on conservation objectives and conservation measures for birds in Natura 2000 sites (OG 25/20 and 38/20). Key measure is preservation of carp fishponds and extensive fish production. Monitoring and colour-ringing projects are continuously undertaken, with around 800 colour-ringed birds. Migratory flyways and important stopover sites were identified (Pigniczki et al 2016, Kralj et al 2013) and survival rates estimated (Kralj 2018). Implementation of the ISSAP is regularly assessed at ESIEG meetings. Croatian representatives are active members of ESIEG.

Please rate the degree of current implementation of the plan taking into account the time schedule of the ISSAP

Moderate implementation - some of the actions are underway as per the time schedule of the ISSAP

Please provide details and reasons for the lower degree of implementation.

>>> Lack of resources and cooperation.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

12. Has your country provided assistance for the coordination and implementation of International Species Action or Management Plans through funding of AEWA International Species Working and Expert Groups? (Resolution 7.5)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> The national budget in 2019 and 2020 did not allow for that kind of donations. However, one Croatian expert was involved and coordinated the work of the AEWA Eurasian Spoonbill International Expert Group (ESIEG), contributing in-kind to this specific activity.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

13. Has your country provided financial or in-kind assistance for the development of new International Species Action or Management Plans? (Resolution 7.5)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Main reason is the limitation of the national budget. Also, there was no new International Species Action or Management Plan developed for species relevant to Croatia in the reporting period.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

14. Has a review and prioritization been undertaken in your country of the resources needed to develop national action plans in response to ISSAPs, implement those plans and coordinate their implementation? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.2(g))

Yes

When was this review and prioritization completed?

>>> In general, the review and prioritization of the development of national management and action plans for strictly protected species was made in 2017. However, due to the lack of financial and administrative capacities the priorities for development and adoption of national management and action plans did not include species that are covered by the AEWA ISSAPs.

Please attach the review and prioritization or provide a weblink to it. If not available, please summarise the main points.

>>> The prioritization made in 2017 did not include species covered by AEWA ISSAPs.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Management plans and conservation measures - List of priority species for development and adoption of national management and action plans

Has a corresponding national resource mobilization plan been established?

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> There was no need for such a plan. The preparation of priority species national management and action plans was included in the scope of the Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014-2020.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

15. Does your country have in place or is your country developing a National Single Species Action Plan for any species/population for which an AEWA ISSAP has not been developed? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.2.2)

No

16. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines for the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What has been used instead as a basis for the preparation of NSSAPs?

>>> Although the national single species action plans (NSSAPs) are not developed yet preparations for their development were made and in this process AEWA Guidelines were used and will be used in the future because they correspond to principles and methods used in preparation of action plans for other species (e.g. large carnivores).

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.2. Single Species Action Plans

>>> No additional information

4.3 Emergency Measures

17. Please report on any emergency situation that has occurred in your country over the past triennium and has threatened waterbirds. (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.3)

Please indicate whether an emergency situation threatening waterbirds, such as botulism, chemical pollution, earthquake, extreme weather, fire, harmful algal bloom, infectious disease, introduction of alien species, lead poisoning, nuclear accident, oil spill, predation, volcanic activity, war or other emergency (please specify), has occurred in the country over the past triennium.

No emergency situation has occurred

18. Are there any other emergency response measures, different from the ones applied in response to the emergency situations reported above, that were developed and are in place in your country so that they can be used in future in emergency cases?

No

19. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> In the reporting period 2018-2020 there was no emergency situations for migratory waterbirds.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 3.3. Emergency Measures

>>> No additional information

4.4 Re-establishments

20. Is your country maintaining a national register of re-establishment projects occurring or planned to occur wholly or partly within your country? (Resolution 4.4)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Until now no re-establishment project was proposed, approved or undertaken. Nevertheless, according to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Ordinance on the method of preparing and implementing risk assessment studies with respect to introduction, reintroduction and breeding of wild taxa (OG 34/08), the ministry responsible for nature protection is obliged to keep the records of granted authorisations for introduction, reintroduction or breeding.

21. Is there a regulatory framework for re-establishments of species, including waterbirds, in your country (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.4)?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Re-introduction of extinct wild species and repopulation of wild species is regulated with the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) and Ordinance on the method of preparing and implementing risk assessment studies with respect to introduction, reintroduction and breeding of wild taxa (OG 34/08). It is important to stress that provisions related to re-introduction and re-population of wild species are in force since 2005 and were a part of the former Nature Protection Act (OG 70/05, 139/08, 57/11).

22. Has your country considered, developed or implemented re-establishment projects for any species/population listed on AEWA Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.4)

No

23. Has your country used the AEWA conservation Guidelines on the translocation of waterbirds for conservation purposes?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What was used instead as a basis for dealing with the issue?

>>> No translocation was done in the reporting period 2018-2020.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.4. Re-establishments

>>> No additional information

4.5 Introductions

24. Does your country have legislation in place, which prohibits the introduction into the environment of non-native species of animals and plants which may be detrimental to migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.1)

Yes, and being enforced

Please provide the following details: title of legislation, year of adoption, institution that adopted it, institution that enforces it. Please clarify whether legislation applies to/is consistent throughout the entire country or only to particular states/provinces.

>>> Introduction into the environment of non-native species is prohibited by provisions of the Act on Prevention of Introduction and Spread of Alien and Invasive Alien Species and their Management (OG 15/18 and 14/19) and before adoption of that act in 2018 the prohibition was prescribed with provisions of the Nature Protection Act since 2005. The Act on Prevention of Introduction and Spread of Alien and Invasive Alien Species and their Management took over all provisions on alien species from the Nature Protection Act and serves as framework for implementation of the Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species. This Act was adopted by the Croatian Parliament and is enforced by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, together with the Ministry of Finance – Customs Directorate and the State Inspectorate. This Act applies to the entire country.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

25. Does your country impose legislative requirements on zoos, private collections, etc. in order to avoid the accidental escape of captive animals belonging to non-native species which may be detrimental to migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.2)

Yes, and being enforced

Please provide the following details: title of the document, year of adoption, institution that adopted it, institution that enforces it. Please clarify whether legislation applies to/is consistent throughout the entire country or only to particular states/provinces.

>>> Title: Animal Protection Act (OG 102/17 and 32/19) adopted in 2017 by the Croatian Parliament

Institution that enforces it: Ministry of Agriculture

Title: Ordinance on establishing and licensing of the ZOOs (OG 67/05)

Year of Adoption: 2005

Institution that adopted it: Ministry of Agriculture

Institution that enforces it: Ministry of Agriculture

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> ZOO licensing is regulated with Animal Protection Act and Ordinance on establishing and licensing of the ZOOs (OG 67/05). According to Article 6 of this Ordinance, a plan for preventing the escape of animals from the ZOO and preventing intrusion from outside, must be a part of the application for ZOO licence.

26. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate non-native species of waterbird so as to prevent negative impacts on indigenous species? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 2.5.3)

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> There was no record on non-native waterbirds in Croatia, so no eradication deemed necessary.

27. Has your country considered, developed or implemented programmes to control or eradicate other non-native species (in particular aquatic weeds and terrestrial predators) so as to prevent negative impacts on migratory waterbirds? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraphs 2.5.3 and 4.3.10 and Resolution 5.15)

Yes

Please list the non-native species for which relevant action has been undertaken

>>> In the framework of the EU financed project Development of the system for management and control of invasive alien species (2017-2021) implemented by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development five management plans for control of widely spread invasive alien species will be developed: for the Signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*), the Javan moongoose (*Herpestes javanicus*), the Pond slider (*Trachemys scripta*), the Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) and the Common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*).

Please provide further information for each relevant programme

>>> There is no further information.

28. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on avoidance of introductions of non-native waterbird species?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What was used instead as a basis for dealing with the issue?

>>> No, due to the fact that there was no record on non-native waterbirds in Croatia. However, certain elements of the AEWA Guidelines were implemented through the provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13) and now the new Act on Prevention of Introduction and Spread of Alien and Invasive Alien Species and their management (OG 15/18, 14/19) as well as the Ordinance on the method of preparing and implementing risk assessment studies with respect to introduction, reintroduction and breeding of wild taxa (OG 35/08) that is still in force. Also, some elements are implemented through the Animal Protection Act (OG 102/17 and 32/19) and Ordinance on establishing and licensing of the ZOOs (OG 67/05), where there is an obligation for ZOOs to have a plan for preventing the escape of animals from the ZOO and preventing intrusion from outside.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.5. Introductions

>>> No additional information

4.6 Seabirds

The country has maritime territories and the AEWA seabird conservation priorities are relevant for the country:

Yes

29. Does your country have comprehensive data on seabird by-catch? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Main reason is lack of financial and administrative capacities to undertake comprehensive analysis.

When and how do you plan to fill these data gaps?

>>> Data gap will be partially filled by implementation of the LIFE ARTINA project (2018-2023).

30. Have you assessed the impact of by-catch by artisanal fisheries to AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Main reason is lack of financial and administrative capacities to undertake such assessment.

When and how do you plan to do that?

>>> In next EU multiannual financial period 2021-2027.

31. Have you assessed the impact of artisanal/recreational fisheries on seabirds' prey? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Main reason is lack of financial and administrative capacities to undertake such assessment.

Collection of information related to by-catch of seabirds is envisaged through the Data base on indicators of the state of marine environment (Croatian Environmental Agency: www.izor.hr/azo), together with data on by-catch of sea turtles and mammals. By-catch of seabirds (e.g. *Phalacrocorax aristotelis desmarestii*) is occurring in Croatia, but there is no systematic collection of data and for that reason there is yet no official data on by-catch in a Data base. For the moment there are some sporadic data on by-catch only for ringed birds collected by the Institute of Ornithology. Also, the Ministry of Agriculture prescribes that fishermen should report by-catch in their logbooks, however this practice is not yet fully in place. The logbook was amended in a way that it lists 11 seabirds that should be reported by fishermen if found as by-catch. The LIFE ARTINA project (2018-2023) implemented by the NGO Biom, will for the first time, enable better implementation of reporting of by-catch in the project area (Southern Adriatic).

When and how do you plan to do that?

>>> In next EU multiannual financial period 2021-2027.

32. Has your country undertaken steps towards the adoption/application of measures to reduce the incidental catch of seabirds and combat Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing practices in the Agreement Area? (Resolution 3.8)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Main reason is lack of financial and administrative capacities to undertake such assessment.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

33. Does your country have comprehensive data on hunting and egg harvesting (both legal and illegal) of AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Hunting of AEWA-listed seabirds is not allowed as well as egg harvesting. Illegal hunting of AEWA-listed seabirds was not recorded.

34. Have you assessed the impact of hunting and egg harvesting (both legal and illegal) on AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Hunting of AEWA-listed seabirds is not allowed as well as egg harvesting. Illegal hunting of AEWA-listed seabirds was not recorded.

35. Have you identified those seabird colonies at risk from invasive non-native species? (Resolution 7.6)

Yes

Please provide details, including references or attach a file, if available.

>>> Seabird colonies at risk from invasive non-native species were identified on small islands surrounding the island of Mljet.

Have you prioritised them for action?

Yes

Please provide details, including references or attach a file, if available.

>>> In 2020 preparation of call for project proposals for the eradication of Javan moongose (*Herpestes javanicus*) on the island of Mljet and several small islands surrounding the island of Mljet has started within the framework of the Croatian Operational Programme 2014-2020. Projects are planned to be implemented in period 2021-2023.

36. Have you identified the key coastal and at-sea areas where responses to oil spills would be most urgently required in relation to the presence of AEWA-listed seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> This activity was not considered as a priority.

When and how do you plan to do that?

>>> This will be done through the regular monitoring of the target features of the Natura 2000 sites.

37. **(Applicable only to countries bordering the North or Baltic Sea)** Has your country undertaken a program of data-collection to validate models of population level impacts of offshore windfarms in the North and Baltic Seas on AEWA seabirds? (Resolution 7.6)

Not Applicable

Please explain the reasons.

>>> -

38. Have you identified priority sites by filling gaps in the Critical Site Network for seabirds (breeding, non-breeding, pelagic and coastal areas)? (Resolution 7.6)

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> The main reason was the lack of resources.

When and how do you plan to fill these data gaps?

>>> Some gaps will be filled after implementation of the LIFE ARTINA project (2018-2023). One of the project aims is to collect as much data as possible (biological data, fisheries data, oceanographic data) needed to identify and designate new areas of importance for birds according to the provisions of the EU Birds Directive (SPA) that will be completely at sea.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Project LIFE ARTINA](#)

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 4.6 Seabirds

>>> -

Pressures and Responses

5. Habitat Conservation

5.1 Habitat Inventories

39. Has your country identified the network of all sites of international and national importance for the migratory waterbird species/populations listed on Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 3.1.2; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.1(a))

Being developed

Please provide starting date and expected date of finalisation

>>> Regarding the launch of the inventory confirmation process for sites of national and international importance for populations of migratory waterbirds listed on Table 1 of AEWA's Annex 3, the Ministry of the Economy and Sustainable Development of the Republic of Croatia in cooperation with the Institute for Ornithology had finalised the site inventory process in December 2020. The list was sent to the AEWA secretariat.

Have you reviewed, confirmed and communicated to the AEWA Secretariat after MOP7 the current list of known nationally and internationally important sites in your country?

Yes

Please confirm when this process was concluded and when the inventory was communicated to the AEWA Secretariat

>>> The inventory was communicated to the AEWA Secretariat in December 2020.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

40. If your country has identified or is currently identifying the networks of sites of international and national importance, were the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on the preparation of site inventories for migratory waterbirds used?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What has been used instead as a basis for the inventory?

>>> Sites have been identified in the framework of preparation of National Ecological Network of Croatia (2005) and later on re-evaluated during preparation of the EU ecological network Natura 2000 (2013). The BirdLife criteria for Important Bird Areas in Europe were used as presented in the publication Heath and Evans 2004. These criteria are based on a site's international importance for threatened bird species, congregatory bird species, assemblages of restricted-range bird species and assemblages of biome-restricted bird species. Criteria have been developed such that, by applying different ('staggered') numerical thresholds, the international importance of a site for a species may be categorized at three distinct geographical levels: global ('A' criteria), European ('B' criteria) and European Union ('C' criteria). For the most categories of criteria, application of criteria involved comparing data provided for each relevant bird species at the site (usually in form of an estimate of bird number of individuals or pairs of the species using the site) against numerical threshold for the species concerned (normally representing 1% of the species population in question). The area was considered "nationally important" according to this criterion if it supports $\geq 1\%$ of the Croatian population of species.

Although AEWA Guidelines were not explicitly used, methodology and criteria for identifying sites of ecological network in Croatia also include requests from AEWA Guidelines.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Implementation of the BirdLife criteria is described in the book Radović et al, (2005): „National Ecological Network – areas important for birds in Croatia“, State institute for Nature Protection, Zagreb.

Optionally, you can provide additional information on section 5.1. Habitat Inventories

>>> -

5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

41. Has your country assessed the future implications of climate change for protected areas and other sites important for waterbirds (i.e. resilience of sites to climate change)? (Resolution 5.13)

For one or more single sites

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Croatia has drafted national "Climate change adaptation strategy in the Republic of Croatia until 2040. with a view on 2070" (more information on available on <http://prilagodba-klimi.hr/> and on <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/countries-regions/countries/croatia>) but the specific assessment of the future implication of climate change for sites important for waterbirds has not been done yet.

The main reason for that is the fact that even though this issue was not considered as a priority, administrative and financial resources were spent on other activities that were considered as a priority, like the development of a comprehensive management framework for Natura 2000 sites and establishing of effective monitoring for species and habitats types of EU importance.

For the national protected area network

No

Please explain the reasons.

>>> Croatia has drafted national "Climate change adaptation strategy in the Republic of Croatia until 2040. with a view on 2070" (more information on available on <http://prilagodba-klimi.hr/> and on <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/countries-regions/countries/croatia>) but the specific assessment of the future implication of climate change for sites important for waterbirds has not been done yet.

The main reason for that is the fact that this issue was not considered as a priority so administrative and financial resources were spent on other activities that were considered as a priority, as the development of a comprehensive management framework for Natura 2000 sites and establishing of effective monitoring for species and habitats types of EU importance.

42. Which sites that were identified as important, either internationally or nationally, for Table 1 migratory waterbird species/populations have been designated as protected areas under the national legislation and have management plans that are being implemented, including with the aim to increase resilience to the effects of climate change? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 3.2.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.3)

Please report separately on internationally important sites, nationally important sites and buffer zones.

Reporting on designation and management of internationally important sites

All sites of international importance

(sites recognized as having international importance for migratory waterbirds following criteria of, for instance, the AEWA Critical Site Network, the Ramsar Convention, the EU Birds Directive (SPAs), the Bern Convention Emerald Network, the BirdLife International's Important Bird Areas)

Total number

>>> 38

Total area (ha)

>>> 1814900

Number of internationally important sites under national protection designation

>>> 38

Area of international importance under national protection designation (ha)

>>> 1814900

Please rate the effectiveness of the national protection designation

High

Please provide details and reasons for the high level of effectiveness.

>>> 38 Special Protected Sites (SPAs) were selected under the EU Birds Directive as the most suitable sites for bird conservation and they are part of the EU ecological network NATURA 2000. The identification and delimitation of Croatian SPAs was entirely based on scientific criteria such as '1% of the population of listed vulnerable species' or 'wetlands of international importance for migratory waterfowl' and other BirdLife criteria for Important Bird Areas in Europe. Such an approach resulted in high effectiveness of coverage of important bird habitats holding significant populations on the national level.

Some protected areas are not being managed effectively so the effectiveness of protected areas in achieving conservation objectives is not satisfactory. Development of site management plans with activities clearly aimed towards achieving species conservation objectives and building capacities of protected areas employees is necessary for the achievement of site conservation objectives. Croatia is currently implementing

the project, financed through EU funds, with the goal of at least 40% of the surface under the Natura 2000 network to have an established management mechanism that will adequately address conservation of species/habitat types. The conservation of habitats and species will be implemented either through the integration of specific conservation measures into management plans of existing protected areas or through adjustments of sectoral management plans or other solutions determined within the scope of the project.

Internationally important protected sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented
Number of sites

>>> 3

Area (in ha)

>>> 29038

Please rate the effectiveness of the management measures

Moderate

Please provide details and reasons for the lower level of effectiveness.

>>> To be able to effectively implement management measures protected areas staff and other stakeholders involved in management need to build on a diversity of necessary skills, knowledge and information. Besides the lack of knowledge and experience, lack of funds holds the implementation of effective conservation management.

Internationally important sites with a management plan in place which is being implemented and includes management objectives related to maintaining or increasing the resilience of existing ecological networks, including resilience to climate change

Number of sites

>>> 0

Area (in ha)

>>> 0

Please rate the effectiveness of the climate resilience measures

Low

Please provide details and reasons for the low level of effectiveness.

>>> Maintaining or increasing resilience to climate change is not specifically addressed within management plans.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

All sites of national importance

Examples of best practice (optional)

If any site, in your opinion, represents an outstanding process of management planning or implementation, please highlight it as an example of best practice (alternatively provide a web link or attach a file)

>>> -

DESIGNATION GAP FILLING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Croatia has designated ecological network Natura 2000 in 2013, based on the best available knowledge at that time. In 2015 the ecological network was amended according to the results of the EU Biogeographical seminar, addressing mostly habitat types listed in Annex I of the Habitats Directive and species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive. If new scientific and expert data appear and if they approve that certain area fulfils Birdlife International criteria for the definition of important bird area the designation of the site will be taken into account. A similar approach is being applied when data supports revision of site conservation goals i.e. species and their population size.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

MANAGEMENT GAP FILING

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> According to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19, 127/19), management plans for sites of the ecological network should be prepared and enacted by public institutions responsible for the management of protected areas and areas of the ecological network. The Operational Program Competitiveness and Cohesion for the period 2014-2020 provide the framework for the project "Development of the management framework for ecological network Natura 2000". This EU funded project started in September 2017 with an aim to develop management plans for more than 200 ecological network sites, including those important for waterbirds (like carp fishponds). For this reason, the specific national action plan for filling gaps in the management of internationally and nationally important sites is not necessary.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

44. Is the network of nationally and internationally important sites for migratory waterbirds integrated into your country's water- and land-use policies and planning and decision-making processes? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.4)

Yes, fully

Please provide details

>>> All important sites for migratory waterbirds are part of the ecological network Natura 2000. According to the Croatian Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) any plan or project likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall undergo an appropriate assessment procedure to determine its implications for the site. The competent authorities can only agree to the plan or project after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned. Consequently, the impact of all water- and land-use policies, planning and decision making must not endanger the achievement of the conservation objectives defined for important sites for migratory birds designated as Natura 2000 sites.

If available, please provide best practice examples of integration of the flyway site network into your country's water- and land-use policies and planning and decision-making processes

>>> N/A

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

45. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on the management of key sites for migratory waterbirds?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What guidance has been used instead?

>>> Existing management plans were prepared based on general IUCN guidelines for management planning of protected areas as well as on objectives of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19)). These are compatible with 8 steps proposed in AEWA Guidelines.

46. Has the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool for the AEWA area been accessed and used in your country? (Resolution 7.9)

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Although CSN Tool has been used for other purposes, it has not been used directly in habitat conservation.

47. Following MOP7, has your country been involved in the establishment of innovative, international, multi-stakeholder partnerships to guide the development and implementation of habitat management, creation and restoration projects in the wider environment? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 4.4(a))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No capacities and/or resources available for such approach

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 5.2. Conservation of Areas and Habitats

>>> -

Pressures and Responses

6. Management of Human Activities

6.1. Hunting

48. Does the legislation of your country implement the principle of sustainable use of waterbirds, as envisaged in the AEWA Action Plan, taking into account the full geographical range of the waterbird populations concerned and their life history characteristics? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.2)

Yes

Please provide details on how this is achieved and reference to the relevant legislation

>>> Croatian hunting legislation implements the principle of sustainable use of waterbirds considered as game species by The Hunting Act (paragraph 9), as envisaged in AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.1 (and listed in Table 1) following relevant legislation:

The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 31/19, 32/20): this Law transposes the provisions contained in the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora; and Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds. The principal aim of this Law is to impose the controlled, safe and rational use of natural resources, with a significant purpose in the function of protecting and preserving biodiversity and the ecological balance of natural habitats, wildlife and wild fauna and flora on the territory of the Republic of Croatia; to ensure the sustainable management of game populations and their habitats in a manner that permanently improves the vitality of the game population, the production capacity of the habitat and biodiversity.

Ministry of Agriculture (Directorate of Forestry, Hunting and Wood Industry) runs SLE (Central Hunting Register - national database), database of all hunting grounds in Croatia. SLE also contains informations about the annual harvest of all game populations (annual take for each population in accordance to valid hunting management plan), including above mentioned waterbird species. Protection measures are determined in The Provisions of Chapter V of the Act (also measures to reduce and eliminate illegal taking).

The Hunting Act is implemented by all other regulated acts, and the most relevant ones are:

Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19) - Article 11. prohibits use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands (hunt on small feathery game)

Ordinance on hunting season closure (OG 94/19) - this Ordinance determines the period of prohibition of hunting (hunting ban) in according with different species of game, depending on their biological properties and ecological conditions in which they live.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Other relevant legislation (considering proficiency test for hunters:

Ordinance on hunters (OG 108/19) - this Ordinance prescribes the conditions and manner of training of hunters and defines the necessary hunter's duties.

Ordinance on the certificate of origin of wild game and their parts and on the manner of marking of game (OG 15/19) - this Ordinance prescribes the correct form of the game certification (certification of origin, possible certification of game parts), and further sets the manner of marking large game, the manner of issuing such logs and keeping records on issued and used game markings. This Ordinance transposes the Annex III, part A and B of the Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds.

49. Does your country have an established system for the collection of harvest data, which covers the species/populations listed in Table 1? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.1(b))

Yes

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

All AEWA species occurring in your country

>>> Waterbird species to which the Agreement applies, and are listed as game according to The Hunting Act:

Scolopax rusticola L. (Eurasian Woodcock)

Gallinago gallinago L. (Common Snipe)

Anser fabalis Latham. (Bean Goose)

Anser albifrons Scopoli. (Greater White-fronted Goose)

Anas platyrhynchos L. (Mallard)

Aythya ferina L. (Common Pochard)

Aythya fuligula L. (Tufted Duck)

Anas querquedula L. /*Spatula querquedula* (Garganey)

Anas crecca L. (Common Teal)

Fulica atra L. (Common Coot)

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

The whole territory of your country

>>> All AEWA species occurring in Croatia are covered by following legislation: The Nature Protection Act and Hunting Act (harvest data for game-listed species); applicable to the whole territory of the country.

Does it cover the following? (tick where applicable and provide details)

All forms of waterbird harvesting

>>> The Hunting Act (with subordinate legislation) covers all harvesting activities.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Ministry of Agriculture (Directorate of Forestry, Hunting and Wood Industry) runs SLE (The Central Hunting Register), national database of all hunting grounds in Croatia. Database also includes Hunting Management Plans/ Game breeding programmes/ Game protection programmes for hunting/non - hunting grounds. Some of the birds covered in Table 1. are listed as small feathery game by the Hunting Act - Scolopax rusticola L. (Eurasian Woodcock), Gallinago gallinago L. (Common Snipe), Anser fabalis Latham. (Bean Goose), Anser albifrons Scopoli. (Greater White-fronted Goose), Anas platyrhynchos L. (Mallard), Aythya ferina L. (Common Pochard), Aythya fuligula L. (Tufted Duck), Anas crecca L. (Common Teal), Fulica atra L. (Common Coot), and are covered in mentioned plans as secondary species, listed in form by gender(sex)/age class (group). Hunting Management Plans/ Game Breeding Programmes/ Game Protection Programmes are adopted for 10 - year period, but before entering into force they must be approved by Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (ex Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection). Annual Reports about game (biological minimum, planned and realised number of individuals/population size, hunting bag etc.), and also for above mentioned AEWA species (mostly their presence in hunting ground is registered, often not hunted during open season), must be submitted every year for Register evidency. Ministry of Agriculture - Hunting Department, delivers data on hunting (annually, for the period from 1 April of the current year to 31 March of the following year - hunting year) to Croatian Bureau of Statistics for Statistical Database purposes.

50. Has your country phased out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.4; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.2(d))

Fully

When was lead shot use in wetlands banned?

>>> The use of lead shot in wetlands on the whole territory of the Republic of Croatia, was banned on the date of accession of the Republic of Croatia to the EU (2013). The Hunting Law is implemented by Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition. Article 11 prohibits use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands (hunt on small feathery game).

What legislation is in place?

>>> The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 31/19 and 32/20); Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19).

Who enforces this legislation?

>>> Ministry of Agriculture.

Has assessment of compliance with the legislation been undertaken?

Yes

Please explain how this was assessed.

>>> The Hunting Act complies with EU harmonisation legislation, and provisions of the Act are implemented by Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19).

Please explain what the compliance with legislation was found to be:

Good (almost full compliance)

Please provide details and reasons for the high level of compliance.

>>> As above mentioned, The Hunting Act complies with EU harmonisation legislation, and provisions of the Act are implemented by all other bylaws (considering Hunting legislation; it is also in compliance with Nature Protection legislation).

Please indicate any known reasons for good compliance or any barriers to compliance. Please attach any published or unpublished references.

>>> Ministry of Agriculture carries out administrative supervision of the hunting legislation. The Hunting Inspection (since January 1st 2019 part of the State Inspectorate) carries out inspection/supervision of hunting

legislation in the field. Since the application of Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19), use of lead shot in wetlands has not been detected. For reported irregular or illegal activities, competent authorities will undertake necessary measures, according to legislative acts.

Has measurement of impact of the legislation been undertaken i.e. where there was a problem of lead poisoning in waterbirds, has this been reduced?

No

If appropriate, please explain the reasons for not doing this.

>>> Measurement of impact of the legislation has not been undertaken, because Croatian legislation does not allow use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Croatia has phased out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands. Ordinance on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19) - Article 11, prohibits use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands.

51. Are there measures in your country to reduce/eliminate illegal taking? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.6; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.2(e))

Yes

How would you rate the effectiveness of the measures?

Moderate

Please provide details and reasons for the lower level of effectiveness.

>>> Measures for protection and breeding of game are stipulated by the Chapter V of The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19, 32/20). Also, they are additionally specified by the hunting management plans, game breeding programmes or game protection programmes (Ordinance on the content, method of preparation and the process of adoption or approval for hunting grounds, wildlife breeding programs and wildlife protection programs; OG 40/06, 92/08, 39/11 and 41/13). Preventing illegal hunting is obligatory for hunting right holders. However, Croatia does not yet have a National action plan for combat illegal killing of birds that will help to address this issue more systematically. Also, there is a lack of on-the-ground actions made by law enforcement officials to tackle illegal killing of birds mostly due to the lack of topic-specific training, capacities with regard to numbers of available officers and equipment, as well as a single procedure protocol.

Please provide details

>>> Measures for protection and breeding of game are stipulated by the Chapter V of The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19 and 32/20). Also, they are additionally specified by the hunting management plans, game breeding programmes or the game protection programmes (Ordinance on the content, method of preparation and the process of adoption or approval for hunting grounds, wildlife breeding programs and wildlife protection programs (OG 40/06, 92/08, 39/11, 41/13). Preventing illegal hunting is obligatory for hunting right holders. Implementation of this measure in practice highly depends on number of hunting rangers in the hunting grounds, as well as hunting inspectors and nature protection inspectors in field (it is considered to be insufficient). Furthermore, much of the illegal hunting prevention depends on education and conscience, as well as the police surveillance/presence in the field and cooperation between all parties included. According to the Criminal Code (OG 125/11, 144/12, 56/15, 61/15, 101/17, 118/18 and 126/19), illegal hunting represents a criminal offence (Article 204).

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information.

52. Does your country maintain an adequate system for making realistic estimates of the number of waterbirds taken illegally? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.1(b))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> This type of system is not prescribed by hunting legislation, although illegal taking/killing must be reported and prevented.

SLE (the Central Hunting Register) is database in which data about legal hunting activities, in accordance with legislation and hunting management plans, game breeding and game protection programmes, are collected, systemized and stored.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> <https://sle.mps.hr/>

53. Is legally binding proficiency testing for hunters, including amongst other things bird identification, in

place in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.8; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.2)

Yes

Please provide details and reference to the relevant legislation

>>> There is legally binding proficiency testing for hunters, the hunting exam, that can be taken by legal persons, authorized for mentioned exams by the Ministry of Agriculture. Game may be hunted by a person who passed the hunting exam and is in possession of the hunter card, with a prior written approval by the user/owner of hunting ground. Potential hunter must pass adequate education(theoretical and practical courses about hunting legislation, game diseases, hunting management, cynology, morphology, weapons and ammunition, hunting ethics, ecology and nature protection) before becoming a hunter in terms of law. Most of parties included in hunting management must have formal education (like professional service for implementation of hunting management plans, hunters etc)

Relevant legislation:

The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19 and 32/20)

Ordinance on hunters (OG 108/19): This Ordinance prescribes the conditions and manner of training of hunters and defines the necessary hunter's duties. This text further determines the form of certificates of competence, and sets out the physical appearance of official hunter cards. Hunter duties are listed as follows: hunt planning and organizing; group hunting management; coordination of individual hunts; implementation of preventive, diagnostic, curative, hygienic-health and bio-technical measures; harmless removal of parts of the game that has been killed. Conditions and method of training are stipulated in Section II.

Ordinance on the professional service for the implementation of hunting management plans (OG 108/19): The professional service organizes, performs and supervises all professional hunting activities and activities regarding the breeding and protection of game and other animal species, game habitats, hunting and hunting facilities, hunting dogs, hunting weapons and ammunition, hunting of wildlife, hunting ethics, game damage, game counts and nutrition, game health and fitness, business documentation, analysis of hunting conditions or areas where hunting grounds are prohibited, as well as other professional activities in hunting sector where hunting grounds are prohibited, as in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations governing hunting, hunting management plans and hunting contract or concession issues.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

54. Are best practice codes and standards for hunting in place in your country in support of enforcement of hunting laws and regulations? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.1.7; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.3)

Yes

What do these cover?

Club Affiliation

Emergency closure of hunting in cases of exceptionally unfavourable or endangering conditions

Please provide details on each item selected above

>>> Club affiliation: HLS (Hrvatski lovački savez - Croatian Hunting Federation) represent association of Croatian hunters (hunters are on local levels organized in hunting clubs/societies), operating through County associations and Zagreb hunting association. It gathers over 60000 hunters (members), representing their interests in country and abroad. The objectives of Federation are nature protection, game breeding and preservation, hunting in accordance with legislation, education of hunters, hunting exams, issue of hunter cards etc.

Emergency closure of hunting in cases of exceptionally unfavourable or endangering conditions: Ordinance on the conditions and methods for hunting, carrying of hunting weapons, form and manner for the issuing of hunting cards, permission to hunt and records on the completed hunt or hunting sessions (OG 70/10) - Articles 3 - 7; Ordinance/Regulation on the use of hunting weapons and ammunition (OG 37/19) Article 7; The Hunting Act (OG 99/18, 32/19 and 32/20) Articles 54,55

Optional [Please upload links or examples]

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[HLS \(Hrvatski lovački savez - Croatian Hunting Federation\)](#) - Croatian Hunting Federation - association of hunting clubs/societies in Croatia; member of FACE (European Federation for Hunting and Conservation)

Please rate the degree of application of these best practice codes and standards:

High (almost always applied)

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of application

>>> Explained in previous answers.

Please rate the effectiveness these best practice codes and standards in supporting enforcement of hunting laws and regulations:

High (very effective in supporting enforcement of hunting laws and regulations)

Please provide details and reasons for the high degree of effectiveness

>>> Explained in previous answers.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

55. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What other guidance has been used instead?

>>> Elements and provisions of AEWA Conservation Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory birds are implemented by national legislation in force.

Optionally, you can provide additional information on section 6.1. Hunting

>>> New Hunting Act has entered into force in 2018 (other subordinate regulations are in accordance with the Act, or are in process of approximation). Hunting legislation is in compliance with the provisions contained in the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as well as with nature protection legislation.

6.2. Ecotourism

56. Is wetland- and waterbird-related ecotourism integrated into your country's national tourism development strategies or other relevant national strategies? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.2.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 2.5(c))

Yes

Please describe and provide details

>>> According to the Strategy on Development of Tourism in Republic of Croatia until 2020 (OG 55/13), the ecotourism in Croatia is recognised as poorly developed form of tourism, but with great potential for further development with regard to Natura 2000 areas, including protected areas (like national parks and nature parks) and high biodiversity. Wetlands and watercourses are recognised as one of the areas where future resorts/camps for ecotourism can be developed.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

57. Are there existing ecotourism initiatives in your country specifically based on migratory waterbirds and their habitats? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.5)

Yes

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Croatia-an emerging birding destination](#) - Specialized web page for birdwatchers in Croatia with possibilities to choose birdwatching destinations, including wetlands

[Bird watching is one of the fastest growing branches of tourism](#) - Expert meeting organized by the Public Institution Medimurje Nature on the topic "Birdwatching tourism in continental Croatia - state and possibilities of development"

[Birdwatching-touristic product promoting the town of Nin](#) - Event of denoting the European Bird Count Day in the Saline Nin, organized by the Tourist Board of the City of Nin and the Public Institution Natura Jadera

Please describe how many initiatives are in place and provide details for each of them

>>> There are several existing ecotourism initiatives in Croatia focusing on birdwatching including also migratory waterbirds. Some initiatives are undertaken by public institutions for management of protected areas and Natura 2000, local communities and tourist boards as well as by travel agencies that are specialised for birding. In general, interest for birding in Croatia is slightly increasing.

Please rank the degree to which these initiatives are designed to deliver both conservation and community benefits:

Medium

Please provide details

>>> The above mentioned initiatives are focused on the promotion of birdwatching in Croatia and possibilities of its future development while at the same time promoting bird conservation and most promising destinations for ecotourism in Croatia.

Please rank the degree to which these dual benefits are being delivered in practice:

Medium

Please provide details and the reasons for successful delivery and barriers to fuller delivery

>>> Ecotourism, including birdwatching is a prosperous, but still not enough recognised branch of tourism in Croatia. When practiced it is focused on nature conservation and is contributing to awareness raising, but due to the limited application it does not yet have significant financial impact on local communities.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 6.2. Ecotourism

>>> No additional information

6.3. Other human activities

58. Have restrictions on use of lead fishing weights been introduced in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12). When answering this question please also consider question 78 in chapter 7 - Research and monitoring.

No

If appropriate, please provide further details.

>>> To be able to decide on restriction of use of lead fishing weights the comprehensive assessment is needed which was not undertaken in the reporting period.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

59. Does your country have legislation in place, which provides for Strategic Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Assessment (SEA/EIA) of activities potentially negatively affecting natural habitats or wildlife? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.1; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.5)

Yes and being implemented

Does this legislation apply to the entire country or only to particular states/provinces thereof?

Entire country

Please provide details

>>> Current SEA and EIA procedures in Republic of Croatia are prescribed by the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and are harmonized with relevant EU directives. Both procedures are applicable for the whole territory of the Republic of Croatia.

Do the SEA/EIA processes consider waterbirds and habitats on which they depend?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Both, the SEA and the EIA consider waterbirds and their habitats. Current SEA and EIA procedures in Republic of Croatia are prescribed by the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and are harmonized with relevant EU directives. Evaluation of impact on nature of strategies, plans, programmes or projects is undertaken according to the Environmental Protection Act, Regulation on strategic environmental assessment of plans and programs (OG 3/17) and Regulation on environmental impact assessment (OG 61/14 and 3/17).

The Appropriate Assessment of the impact of strategies, plans, programmes or projects on the Natura 2000 ecological network (e.g. its target features – species and/or habitats) is carried out, either in the scope of the SEA/EIA procedures (strategies, programmes and large scale plans/projects), or as stand-alone procedure according to provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19). The Nature Protection Act is harmonized with the EU Habitats Directive and Birds Directive.

Do the SEA/EIA processes include public participation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The obligation of public information and participation of the public, as well as the public concerned in the SEA and the EIA procedures is determined by the provisions of Articles 160-166 of the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18). By the provisions of these Article, public authorities responsible for the strategic environmental assessment, environmental impact assessment, evaluation of the need for environmental impact assessment and for establishing the content of the environmental impact study prior to its preparation, are obliged to inform the public about those procedures. According to the Environmental Protection Act, in the cases of the EIA procedure or the procedure for evaluating the need for EIA, the public has to be informed on the submitted request and the issued act stating the decision on the request. By the provision of Article 161, Paragraph 2 of the Environmental Protection Act it is determined that the deadline which is set for informing the public in such cases may not be shorter than 30 days. The manner of informing the public and the public concerned in the aforementioned procedures is prescribed in details by the Regulation on information and participation of the public and public concerned in environmental matters (OG 64/08). More information on legal provisions can be found on the web page of the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

[Access to Information - Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development](#)

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

60. Are there any other legal and/or administrative measures in your country to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts of development activities on the sites of national and international importance for migratory birds? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 3.5)

Yes

Please describe each measure and provide details for each of them

>>> According to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) the Appropriate Assessment of the impacts of strategies, plans, programmes or projects or their amendments is carried out for any strategy, plan, programme or project that can alone or in combination with other strategies, plans, programmes or projects have a significant adverse effect on the conservation objectives and the integrity of the Natura 2000 ecological network sites. The Appropriate Assessment procedure is a legal measure that is used to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts of development activities on the Natura 2000 sites designated for birds according to the EU Birds Directive, including the sites of national and international importance for migratory birds.

Please rank the effectiveness of these measures:

High

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

61. In the last three years, has your country used SEA/EIA for all relevant projects, including energy sector projects such as renewable energy developments and power lines installation, to assess the impact of proposed projects on migratory waterbird species listed on Table 1 and/or habitats/sites on which they depend? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.1, Resolution 5.11 and Resolution 5.16; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.5(b))

Yes, all proposed projects

Please provide information on the outstanding cases

>>> Having in mind that all migratory waterbird species listed in Table 1 to the AEWA Action Plan occurring on the territory of the Republic of Croatia are either strictly protected according to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) or managed in a controlled way and thus also protected according to the Hunting Act (OG 99/18 and 32/19), the impact of projects on population of these species or their habitats must be assessed (as well as for all other protected birds in Croatia) as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment or as part of the stand-alone Appropriate Assessment procedure. For that reason all relevant projects falling into the scope of Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and/or Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) having impact on migratory waterbird populations, including energy sector projects such as renewable energy developments and power lines installations, were assessed in last three years.

Where an SEA/EIA has identified a likelihood of significant negative impacts on migratory waterbirds, have steps been taken to avoid these impacts, including avoidance of protected areas and other sites of importance for migratory waterbirds?

Yes

Please describe the measures put in place

>>> In such cases the alternatives have been investigated and/or mitigation measures were prescribed related to the operating regime of the installations, painting the obstacles, warning obstacles on overhead power lines, administrative measures such as permitted operating time in a day/month/season, use of non-destructive construction methods, noise control etc.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

62. Do you maintain a record of the cases of adverse impacts of development activities and other pressures on sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 3.5(a))

Yes

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country that are subject to adverse impact of development activities or other pressures. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and observed impacts.

>>> Number of sites: 0

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country where adverse impact of development activities or other pressures has been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and the impacts that have been addressed.

>>> On all 38 Special Protected Areas - SPAs (important bird areas) many different development activities are being implemented, but for all of them the Appropriate Assessment procedure as well as the EIA procedures (where appropriate) are conducted and mitigation measures are applied. Throughout these procedures and with implementation of the mitigation measures, adverse impacts of the project/development activity are avoided and also the long-term goal to maintain the habitats of species for which the site has been designated in favourable condition, is achieved

Please report the number of sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in your country where no effective avoidance, mitigation or compensation has been implemented for adverse impact of development activities or other pressures. Please list those sites with their names, central geographic coordinates and observed impacts.

>>> Number of sites: 0

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

63. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on how to avoid, minimize or mitigate impact of infrastructural developments and related disturbance affecting waterbirds?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl** button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Although AEWA Guidelines on how to avoid, minimize or mitigate impact of infrastructural developments and related disturbance affecting waterbirds, have not been directly used, its elements are already implemented through the SEA and EIA procedures under the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18).

64. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.11 on Power Lines and Migratory Waterbirds.

64.1. Are relevant stakeholders, including government agencies, scientific bodies, nongovernmental organisations and the energy sector, being regularly consulted in order to monitor jointly the impacts of power lines on waterbirds and to agree on a common policy of action?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> In general the above mentioned stakeholders (national agencies, national energy distribution company, NGOs etc.) are usually consulted through the EIA or SEA procedure where public consultations and public

insight into the EIA or SEA studies are carried out. There is a quite long cooperation between ministry responsible for nature protection and national energy distribution company (HEP) on mitigation of electrocution problems for white storks breeding on electricity poles. Association BIOM (NGO) supported by the national energy distribution company (HEP) in 2016 started a project for identifying electrocution and collision black spots on two pilot areas in Croatia with the aim to develop conservation measures. However the project was not finalized. Since November 2020, Croatia is participating in the European project for the prevention of electrocution and collision of thousands of birds with transmission lines "The LIFE Danube Free Sky -Transnational conservation of birds along the Danube river". This project is targeting the problem of electrocution and collisions of wild birds with power lines along one of the most important migration corridors, stop-over sites and wintering places for many bird species in Europe - the Danube river. In Croatia, the LIFE Danube Free Sky project will be implemented by three partners - the Kopački rit Nature Park Public Institution, HEP-Distribution System Operator and the Croatian Transmission System Operator. During the planned five years of project implementation, 15 partners from seven countries will develop strong cooperation and implement the most effective solutions to prevent these threats to birds. After this period, the visibility of more than 245 km of top priority power lines will be increased. Also, more than 3200 of the most dangerous poles within the project area will be adjusted to ensure birds' safety.

You have attached the following Web links/URLs to this answer.

Title: Web page of the LIFE Danube Free Sky project

64.2. Has a baseline of waterbird distribution, population sizes, migrations and movements (including those between breeding, resting and feeding areas) been established as early as possible in the planning of any power line project, over a period of at least five years, and with particular emphasis on those species known to be vulnerable to electrocution or collision?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> All important sites for waterbirds are part of ecological network Natura 2000 therefore any power line project must have SEA and EIA procedure with emphasis on those species known to be vulnerable to electrocution or collision. Each and every site in the ecological network Natura 2000 designated for waterbirds has a baseline data on waterbirds distribution, population size, migration and movements and they are taken into concern while assessment of the impact of the power line project.

64.3 If such studies, as described in the question above, have identified any risks, has every effort been made to ensure these are avoided?

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> If there is reasonable doubt that some project could represent a danger concerning the collision or electrocution mitigation measures can be applied (for example enhancing visibility of power lines or fitting the insulators on killer poles). Those mitigation measures are obligatory for the investor since they are prescribed in the building permit.

64.4. Have the location, route and direction of new power lines been designated on the basis of national zoning maps?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Location, route and direction of a power lines are defined in relevant spatial plans. County spatial plans are subject to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) procedure according to the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18). Spatial plans of lower order (e.g. municipal plans, city plans etc.) have to be in line with the county plan according to the Physical Planning Act (OG 153/13, 65/17, 114/18, 39/19 and 98/19). Furthermore, projects for construction of the power lines are subject to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedure according to the Environmental Protection Act. For power lines of the voltage of 220 kV and more, or length more than 10 km the EIA procedure is obligatory. For the power lines of the voltage of 110 kV and more and which are part of the transmission network, the evaluation of the need for environmental impact assessment has to be carried out. However, for all power lines that can have a negative impact on birds that are target features of the Natura 2000 sites (e.g. the Special Protection Areas - SPAs), including the waterbird migratory species, the Appropriate Assessment (AA) has to be carried out according to the provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19). If needed, in the scope of the AA procedure, the mitigation measures that minimize negative impacts on migratory waterbird species can be defined.

64.5. Has, wherever possible, the construction of power lines along major migration flyways and in habitats of conservation importance* been avoided, where such construction is likely to have significant effects on waterbirds?

* such as Special Protection Areas under the EU Birds Directive, Important Bird Areas, protected areas, Ramsar sites, the West/Central Asian Site Network for Siberian Crane and other waterbirds and other critical sites as identified by the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool for the African-Eurasian region.

Yes

Please provide details.

>>> For all power lines that can have a negative impact on birds that are target features of the Natura 2000 sites (e.g. the Special Protection Areas – SPAs), including the waterbird migratory species, the Appropriate Assessment (AA) has to be carried out according to the provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19). If needed, in the scope of the AA procedure, the mitigation measures that minimize negative impacts on migratory waterbird species can be defined.

64.6. Are bird-safe designs in the construction of new power infrastructure, including measures designed to reduce electrocution and collisions being used in your country?

Partially

Please provide details

>>> Bird safe designs are used, whenever possible and in line with financial limitations.

64.7. Have those sections of existing power lines that are causing relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision been identified?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> Up to now, there are no sections of existing power lines, recognized as ones causing relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision.

64.8. Where sections of existing power lines have been identified to cause relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision, have they been modified as a matter of priority?

Partially

Please provide details.

>>> The sections of existing power lines identified to cause relatively high levels of waterbird injury and/or mortality due to electrocution and/or collision are modified whenever possible and in line with financial limitations.

64.9. Is there in your country regular monitoring and evaluation of the impact of power lines on waterbird populations at the national scale?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> Post-construction monitoring is performed based on the EIA decision issued for the power line construction projects for which the EIA procedure has been conducted according to provisions of the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18). Upon expiration of the obligatory monitoring period defined in EIA decision, for the moment, there is no established regular monitoring at the national scale of impacts of power lines on bird populations, including waterbird populations. However, since July 2009 national distribution company “HEP- Operator distribucijskog sustava d.o.o.” has begun collecting data about bird electrocution on distribution lines. In case of frequently transient faults on overhead lines, monitored by SCADA system, they send fieldworkers to check the reason of noted problems. Notes on date and place of electrocution (part of the power line) and bird species (if possible) are sent to central office. Bird electrocution reporting is a standard procedure during overhead lines inspections in “HEP - Operator distribucijskog sustava d.o.o. Parts of distribution network with highest bird casualties and with casualties of endangered bird species are rated as priorities for retrofitting or changes for bird conservation.

64.10. Is there in your country regular monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation measures put in place to minimise the impact of power lines on waterbird populations?

Partial

Please provide details.

>>> Post-construction monitoring is performed based on the EIA decision issued for the power line construction projects for which the EIA procedure has been conducted according to provisions of the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18). Upon expiration of the obligatory monitoring period defined in EIA decision, for the moment, there is no established regular monitoring at the national scale of impacts of power lines on bird populations, including waterbird populations.

64.11. Have the measures contained in Resolution 5.11. been included in your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and relevant legislation?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Measures contained in Resolution 5.11 on Power Lines and Migratory Waterbirds are not directly included in Croatian NSAP. However, the current Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17) includes strategic objectives, specific objectives and concrete actions (action plans) that support implementation of the Resolution 5.11. Furthermore, the legal framework consisting of the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) are in line with the Resolution 5.11. Namely the Environmental Protection Act gives a legal framework for SEA and EIA procedure, including public participations based on the provisions of the Aarhus Convention, while the Nature Protection Act gives a legal framework for the Appropriate Assessment procedure for plans and projects, including the implementation of mitigation measures, designation of Natura 2000 sites as well as for research and monitoring of waterbird populations.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

65. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on how to avoid or mitigate impact of electricity power grids on migratory birds in the African-Eurasian region?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reasons. What other guidance has been used instead?

>>> Although the Guidelines have not been used directly, its elements are implemented and used in practice. As mentioned previously the location, route and direction of power lines are defined in relevant spatial plans. County spatial plans are subject to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) procedure according to the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) while spatial plans of lower order (e.g. municipal plans, city plans etc.) have to be in line with the county plan according to the Physical Planning Act (153/13, 65/17, 114/18, 39/19, 98/19).

66. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 5.16 on Renewable Energy and Migratory Waterbirds.

66.1. Has a national sensitivity and zoning mapping to avoid overlap of renewable energy developments with areas of importance for migratory waterbirds been developed in your country?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> Most important reason was lack of resources. Development of guidelines on sensitivity zones for wind farms and development of maps of sensitivity zones with regard to birds, bats and mammals is planned in next few years. Also, it is planned to develop the maps of sensitivity zones of species/habitat types related to aquatic and wetland ecosystems in relation to hydropower utilization and construction of hydropower plants. However, based on data from available data bases as well as information collected in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) procedure according to the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and the Appropriate Assessment (AA) procedure according to the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19), the spatial plans take account on sensitivity of specific zones and wherever a likelihood of significant negative impacts exists, potentially problematic projects are dislocated.

66.2. Have any international environmental guidelines, recommendations and criteria been followed in your country for impact assessment of renewable energy developments and the utilization of renewable energy sources?

Yes

Please describe which guidelines, recommendations and criteria have been followed.

>>> The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development follows (within the process of evaluation the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Appropriate Assessment (AA) studies) among others: "EU Guidance on wind energy development in accordance with the EU nature legislation"(available at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf) and AEWA Guidelines - Renewable Energy Technologies and Migratory Species: Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment (Resolution 6.11), as well. There is a recommendation of Croatian authorities for investors and planners to follow the guidelines and recommendation for assessment of the impact of windfarms on birds developed and regularly

updated by Schottish Natural Heritage (www.snh.org).

66.3. Is post-construction monitoring being undertaken of the renewable energy installations and associated infrastructure in your country?

Yes

Please share information and lessons learnt from the post-construction monitoring.

>>> Post-construction monitoring is part of the most licenses of renewable energy projects, but application of mitigation measures to mitigate the post-construction impacts revealed by monitoring still represents challenge for the authorities and for investors.

Has adverse effect on migratory waterbirds and their habitats been identified?

No

66.4. Where damage cannot be avoided or mitigated, has compensation for damages to biodiversity been provided?

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> There were no cases where compensation of damage was needed

Operate wind farms in ways that minimise bird mortality, for example by introducing shortterm shutdowns during peak migration and minimising lighting in wind farms.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Minimizing lighting in wind farms is measure regularly prescribed in positive appropriate assessment opinion issued by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development

Dismantling of wind turbines in existing installations, should waterbird mortality have an effect on the population status of a species and other mitigation measures have proved insufficient.

Not applicable

Please explain the reasons

>>> Up to today we didn't have such adverse impact on waterbirds i.e. the one that should be followed with dismantling of wind turbines.

Focusing research efforts on alleviating the negative effects on waterbirds from wind farms, such as the mapping of the main migration corridors and migration crossings for waterbirds also allowing the optimising of wind farm layouts.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Insufficient resources have been allocated for such focused research in Croatia.

66.6. Have any specific measures been put in place to assess, identify and reduce potential negative impacts of biofuel production on migratory waterbirds and their habitats?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> There was no projects conducted in the reporting period on impact of biofuel production on migratory water birds and their habitats.

66.7. Have the measures contained in Resolution 5.11. been included in your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and relevant legislation?

No

Please explain the reasons. What are the constraints preventing implementation of this activity?

>>> Measures contained in the Resolution 5.11. on Power Lines and Migratory Waterbirds are not part of the existing Strategy and Action plan for Protection of Nature of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/2017). However, recent legislation, specifically the Environmental Protection Act (OG 80/13, 153/13, 78/15, 12/18 and 118/18) and the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) already gave a framework for effective implementation of the Resolution 5.11.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Two new guidelines for environmental assessment of wind farms and powerlines in Croatia have been compiled through a multi-stakeholder process that was facilitated by Association Biom and included relevant government institutions, ornithologists and EIA consultancies, as well as international experts from NatureScot (formerly Scottish Natural Heritage) and others. Both guidelines will be published in April 2021.

67. Has your country used the following AEWA Conservation Guidelines - Renewable Energy Technologies and Migratory Species: Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment (Resolution 6.11)?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development follows, within the process of evaluation the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the Appropriate Assessment (AA) studies, among others, the AEWA Guidelines - Renewable Energy Technologies and Migratory Species: Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment (Resolution 6.11).

68. Is by-catch of waterbirds in fishing gear taking place in your country? (Resolution 3.8) (Please respond to this question only with respect to species, which are NOT considered seabirds. Seabird by-catch is dealt with in section 4.6 Seabirds)

No Information

When and how do you intend to fill this information gap?

>>> The data collection is not carried out in freshwater habitats. The information gap will be filled in the period 2022-2027

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

70. Has any project / initiative been implemented in your country that promotes the integration of cultural and provisioning ecosystem services of migratory waterbirds into policy and decision-making affecting them or their habitats? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 2.6)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> For the moment this is not considered to be the priority. Project priorities are focused on the development of Natura 2000 management plans and setting up of the comprehensive monitoring system of species and habitat types of EU importance.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 6.3. Other Human Activities

>>> -

Pressures and Responses

7. Research and Monitoring

71. Does your country have in place waterbird monitoring schemes for the AEWA species? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Actions 1.4(a) and 1.4(b))

Yes

Covering the breeding period

Guidance: Including pre- and post-breeding sites of concentration, such as moulting sites close to breeding areas

Partially

Please provide details. (incl. list the species covered OR not covered (whichever list is shorter))

>>> Existing monitoring activities have only partial coverage because not all waterbird species are covered or not all important sites are covered, or monitoring schemes do not yield statistically robust estimates of breeding population size and trend at least once in every triennium.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Monitoring protocols define which environmental data and data about pressures on habitats should be collected during monitoring activities. The aim of this is to monitor and identify threats to provide information about the reason for changes in diversity and abundance and that could be averted through adequate management actions.

Covering the passage period

Partially

Please provide details. (incl. list the species covered OR not covered (whichever list is shorter))

>>> Coverage is only partial because only one internationally and nationally important site for passage birds (SPA „Neretva river delta“) are comprehensively covered at least monthly in the passage period.

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> NGOs that implement monitoring do not have the capacity and resources to include collecting information on drivers of population trends into their bird census activities.

Covering the non-breeding/wintering period

Partially

Please provide details. (incl. list the species covered OR not covered (whichever list is shorter))

>>> Coverage is not full because not all internationally and nationally important non-breeding/wintering sites are covered at least by one comprehensive annual count. Data for non-breeding /wintering period are collected through the International Waterbird Census.

List of the 91 species covered:

Accipiter gentilis
Accipiter nisus
Acrocephalus melanopogon
Actitis hypoleucos
Aix galericulata
Alcedo atthis
Alopochen aegyptiaca
Anas acuta
Anas clypeata
Anas crecca
Anas penelope
Anas platyrhynchos
Anas querquedula
Anas strepera
Anser albifrons
Anser anser
Anser fabalis
Anthus spinoletta

Ardea alba
Ardea cinerea
Ardea purpurea
Aythya ferina
Aythya fuligula
Aythya marila
Aythya nyroca
Botaurus stellaris
Branta ruficollis
Bucephala clangula
Buteo buteo
Calidris alpina
Casmerodius albus
Cettia cetti
Charadrius alexandrinus
Chroicocephalus ridibundus
Ciconia ciconia
Cinclus cinclus
Circus aeruginosus
Circus cyaneus
Cygnus columbianus
Cygnus olor
Egretta alba
Egretta garzetta
Emberiza schoeniclus
Falco columbarius
Falco peregrinus
Falco tinnunculus
Fulica atra
Gallinago gallinago
Gallinula chloropus
Gavia arctica
Gavia stellata
Grus grus
Haliaeetus albicilla
Larus audouinii
Larus cachinnans
Larus canus
Larus michahellis
Larus ridibundus
Limosa lapponica
Melanitta fusca
Melanitta nigra
Mergellus albellus
Mergus merganser
Mergus serrator
Milvus milvus
Motacilla cinerea
Netta rufina
Numenius arquata
Panurus biarmicus
Phalacrocorax aristotelis
Phalacrocorax carbo
Phalacrocorax pygmaeus
Platalea leucorodia
Pluvialis squatarola
Podiceps auritus
Podiceps cristatus
Podiceps grisegena
Podiceps nigricollis
Rallus aquaticus
Recurvirostra avosetta
Remiz pendulinus
Scolopax rusticola
Somateria mollissima
Sterna sandvicensis

Tachybaptus ruficollis
Tadorna tadorna
Tringa hypoleucos
Tringa nebularia
Tringa ochropus
Tringa totanus
Vanellus vanellus

Is information on drivers of population trends also being collected?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Data for the non-breeding /wintering period are collected through the International Waterbird Census (IWC). The IWC protocol defines some environmental (weather) data to be collected and simple information about “disturbance” as present or non-present during bird census. Those data are not enough to inform about the reason for changes in diversity and abundance and to guide adequate management actions.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Institute for Environment and Nature co-ordinates birds monitoring activities on a national level. Institute implements the project “Development of the National Species and Habitats Monitoring System” with an aim to develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the species and habitats of EU importance, including the development of adequate monitoring programmes for waterbirds.

72. Is data collected through the International Waterbird Census or other relevant monitoring schemes being actively used in your country to inform national-level implementation of AEWA? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 1.5(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> NGOs implementing the International Waterbird Census scheme provides the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Institute for Environment and Nature with results on annual counts. Those results are being entered in the Ministry database, being used for nature conservation purposes and distributed to all interested stakeholders, especially for the purpose of EIA procedures.

73. Has your country supported, technically or financially, other Parties or Range States in designing appropriate monitoring schemes and developing their capacity to collect reliable waterbird population data? (Resolution 5.2)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

74. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on waterbird monitoring?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the **Ctrl button** on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Currently, in Croatia, there is a long tradition of implementing the International Waterbird Census (IWC) methods for the monitoring of sites important for non-breeding waterbird. Monitoring is coordinated by the Croatian NGO Association for Protection of Birds and Nature and is in progress recruiting more and more volunteers and covering more and more sites. Principles of monitoring processes described in “AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol” is being used and will be used in the development of all national monitoring programmes, and is a starting point for the EU funded project “Development of the National Species and Habitats Monitoring System”. This project is implemented within the framework of the Operational Program Competitiveness and Cohesion for the period 2014 – 2020. The project aim is to develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the species and habitats of EU conservation concern, including monitoring programmes for all water birds. The development of monitoring programmes has not yet begun.

75. Has your government provided over the past triennium funds and/or logistical support for the International Waterbird Census and/or other waterbird monitoring scheme at international or national

level? (Resolution 6.3)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

76. Has your country donated funds to the African-Eurasian Waterbird Fund in the past triennium (Resolution 6.3, Resolution 7.7)?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

No

Please explain the reason

>>> Lack of funds

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> -

78. Has the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbirds been investigated in your country? (AEWA Action Plan, paragraph 4.3.12). When answering this question please also consider question 58 in chapter 6 – Management of human activities.

No

Are there plans to investigate the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbirds in your country?

No

Please provide reason(s)

>>> Lack of funds and scientific interest.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 7. Research and Monitoring

>>> -

Pressures and Responses

8. Education and Information

8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

79. Has your country developed and implemented programmes for raising awareness and understanding on waterbird conservation and about AEWA specifically? (Strategic Plan 2009-2017, Objective 4, Target 4.3 and AEWA Action Plan, paragraphs 6.1-6.4, Resolution 3.10, Resolution 5.5; Resolution 6.10)

Guidance: Such programmes should consist of a series of established, long-term communication activities, which are guided by clearly defined goals, target audiences and communication channels. A programme does not constitute a single, one-off communication activity, product or event. In other words, an established national programme to raise awareness and understanding on waterbird conservation and about AEWA would ideally be a number of targeted communication activities which are guided by a communication plan and are backed by sufficient human and financial resources.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of human resources and funds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

80. Has a National AEWA Focal Point for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) been designated by your country? (Resolution 5.5; Resolution 6.10)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of human resources and funds.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

81. Have measures been taken by your country to implement the provisions related to "Education and Information" in the AEWA Action Plan over the last triennium? (AEWA Action Plan, Paragraphs 6.1-6.4)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds and human resources

82. Have World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) activities been carried out in your country during this reporting cycle? (Resolution 5.5)

Yes

Please describe the activity/activities briefly and upload any sample materials, links or photos available related to the activity/event.

>>> World Migratory Birds Day was celebrated each year across the country. Different activities including ornithological camps, workshops, excursions, exhibitions, drawing competition and lectures followed by many media releases were organized by protected areas, museums, NGOs, ZOO etc.

83. Has your country provided funding and/or other support, as appropriate (e.g. expertise, network, skills and resources) towards the implementation of the AEWA Communication Strategy and/or towards priority CEPA activities in the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027? Please consider both national and international funding and different types of support provided. (Resolution 6.10)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of funds and human resources

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Optionally can provide additional information on section 8.1. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

>>> -

Pressures and Responses

9. Implementation

84. Have you undertaken a national assessment of the resources needed for the delivery of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.6.(b))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> No specific national assessment has been undertaken. However, delivery of the activities foreseen by the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 targeting AEWA Parties in case of Croatia is overlapping with major of activities that are planned to fulfil obligations coming from the EU Birds Directive. For the new Multi-annual Financial Framework 2021-2027 all crucial activities will be planned within the new Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2021-2027.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

85. Has your country approached non-contracting party range states to encourage them to accede to the Agreement? (Resolution 3.10; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 5.2)

Report only on activities over the past triennium

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> There was no actions in that regard in the reporting period. The most important reason for no action was lack of administrative and financial resources.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

86. Does your country have in place a national coordination mechanism for implementation of AEWA, possibly linking to national coordination mechanisms for other biodiversity Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)? (Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.3(b))

Guidance: Such mechanism can be a dedicated cross-institutional working group, involving representatives of the civil society and other relevant stakeholders, aimed at planning, coordinating and reporting the implementation of the Agreement in the country. Alternatively, the implementation of AEWA at national level can be coordinated as an extension of larger national coordination mechanisms for other MEAs, such as National Ramsar Committees or CBD NBSAPs coordination.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> National coordination mechanism per se, does not exist. However, AEWA implementation is coordinated by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development on case by case basis, including through the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17). This Strategy was prepared on the basis of the Report on the State of the Natural Environment and Nature Protection in the Republic of Croatia (2008-2012), which contained information on the state of ecological systems, habitat types and wild species. The Strategy is in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020. This Strategy has 5 strategic objectives:

- (1) Increase the effectiveness of basic nature protection mechanisms
- (2) Reduce direct pressures on nature and encourage sustainable use of natural resources
- (3) Strengthen the capacities of the nature protection system
- (4) Increase knowledge and availability of data on nature
- (5) Raise the level of knowledge, understanding and public support for nature protection.

Mentioned strategic objectives are divided into 20 specific objectives and 107 actions.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

87. Have you undertaken a national assessment of the capacity needs for AEWA implementation? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.3.(e))

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> National assessment of capacity needs made particularly for the AEWA implementation was not made. However, assessment of the needs to fulfil obligations arising from the EU Habitats Directive and EU Birds

Directive has been made and strengthening of capacities is important part of several ongoing strategic projects implemented by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development within the Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014-2020. These projects are focused on setting the comprehensive management framework for Natura 2000 sites (including SPAs designated in accordance to the EU Birds Directive) and on development of monitoring and reporting framework for species (including migratory waterbirds) and habitat types of the EU importance. Also, further implementation is planned within the new Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2021-2027. Capacity needs that will be filled by implementation of the before mentioned projects will also cover most of the needs regarding AEWA implementation.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

88. Has your country concluded, or considered concluding, twinning schemes between sites with other countries, the sites of which share common migratory waterbirds or conservation issues? (Resolution 5.20)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of human and financial resources.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> Although the twinning schemes according to the Resolution 5.20 were not initiated/implemented in the reporting period, one cross border project aimed at conservation of Common Terns was implemented. Namely, the project CIGRA – preserving the population of Common Terns in Sava and Drava Basin (Interreg V-A Slovenia-Croatia, September 2017-February 2020) targeted the remaining breeding sites of these species. The aim of the project was to improve nesting sites for Common Terns along the two rivers running between Croatia and Slovenia involving construction of artificial islands for nesting and improving existing sites (fencing, measures to slow down overgrowth, scrub removal etc.), to design and conduct joint monitoring of dynamics of tern populations following restoration, to develop transboundary action plan for terns and to conduct education and public awareness.

89. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the Aichi Targets and the assessment of achieving these targets? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Officers responsible for AEWA implementation work closely with officers responsible for implementation of the CBD and its Strategic Plan 2011-2020. Implementation of both the AEWA and CBD is coordinated by the Nature Protection Directorate of the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

90. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes contributing towards the relevant Sustainable Development Goals and the assessment of achieving these goals? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Officers responsible for AEWA implementation are engaged with national processes contributing towards the relevant SDGs. Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development is responsible for the AEWA implementation and also for implementation of the active sustainable development policy by promoting sustainable production and consumption, low-carbon development and adaptation to climate change, etc. The minister of economy and sustainable development is a member of the National Council for Sustainable Development. The National Council for Sustainable Development was formed in 2018 and is chaired by the Prime Minister, while its work is coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

91. Are those officers in your country's government responsible for AEWA implementation co-ordinated and engaged with national processes to implementation and assess the delivery of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023? (AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Action 5.4(a))

Yes

Please provide details

>>> The Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, Nature Protection Directorate is responsible for implementation of both the AEWA and CMS.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

92. Are the AEWA priorities incorporated into your country's National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) and/or other similar strategic plans and policies (Resolution 6.3; AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027, Target 5.5)?

92.1 NBSAP

Yes

Please provide details

>>> AEWA priorities are covered by the Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17). This Strategy has 5 strategic objectives:

- (1) Increase the effectiveness of basic nature protection mechanisms
- (2) Reduce direct pressures on nature and encourage sustainable use of natural resources
- (3) Strengthen the capacities of the nature protection system
- (4) Increase knowledge and availability of data on nature
- (5) Raise the level of knowledge, understanding and public support for nature protection.

Mentioned strategic objectives are divided into 20 specific objectives and 107 actions.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

92.2 Other strategic plans and policies

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17) is the umbrella strategic document for nature protection in Croatia.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

Sustainable Development Goals

Yes

Please provide details

>>> Relevance of AEWA and other international agreements to which Croatia is a party were promoted through the robust process of preparation and endorsement of the new Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17). New Strategy is in line with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020. This Strategy sets 5 strategic objectives, 20 specific objectives and 107 actions. Each specific objective is linked to adequate Aichi Target of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

Aichi Targets

Yes

Please provide details

>>> AEWA implementation in Croatia is connected with implementation of the EU Birds Directive, through the provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) as well as through implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17). In order to achieve relevant Aichi targets, among other reasons, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development is implementing several strategic projects within the Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014-2020. These projects are focused on setting the comprehensive management framework for Natura 2000 sites (including SPAs designated in accordance to the EU Birds Directive) and on development of monitoring and reporting framework for species (including migratory waterbirds) and habitat types of the EU importance. Also, further implementation is planned within the new Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2021-2027.

Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

Yes

Please provide details

>>> AEWA implementation in Croatia is connected with implementation of the EU Birds Directive, through the provisions of the Nature Protection Act (OG 80/13, 15/18, 14/19 and 127/19) as well as through implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan for Nature Protection of the Republic of Croatia for period 2017-2025 (OG 72/17). In order to achieve relevant Aichi targets, among other reasons, the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development is implementing several strategic projects within the Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014-2020. These projects are focused on setting the comprehensive management framework for Natura 2000 sites (including SPAs designated in accordance to the EU Birds Directive) and on development of monitoring and reporting framework for species (including migratory waterbirds) and habitat types of the EU importance. Also, further implementation is planned within the new Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2021-2027. These projects will also provide for better implementation of relevant elements of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

94. How would your country suggest promoting further links between the biodiversity MEAs to which your country is a Contracting Party, so as to make your work more efficient and effective?

>>> National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPS) are crucial for better implementation of biodiversity MEAs and should be designed to accommodate all priorities coming from MEAs.

95. Has your country donated funds to the AEWA Small Grants Fund (SGF) over the past triennium? (Resolution 7.1)

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Croatia has not resourced the AEWA Small Grants Fund due to limited financial resources in period 2015-2017.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

96. Has your country donated other funding or provided in-kind support to activities coordinated by the Secretariat?

Yes

Please provide details, including amount of funds donated

>>> In 2020 Croatia supported AEWA with the voluntary contribution of 1000 EUR.

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

97. Has your country prioritised and allocated a Junior Professional Officer (JPO) to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for Technical Committee support or for any other area of work? (Resolution 7.11, Resolution 7.12)

Not Applicable: the country has no arrangement with the UN to provide JPOs

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> No additional information

98. Please report on the implementation of Resolution 6.21 on Resource mobilisation for the implementation of AEWA.

98.1 Did your country's government provide in the last triennium financial and/or in-kind resources to support national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of this Agreement, particularly those in line with the AEWA Strategic Plan including the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa, and in accordance with your national plans, priorities and programmes?

Yes

Please describe the resources provided

>>> Some financial resources were secured for regular monitoring and coloured ringing of waterbirds. Also national funding for EU financed projects within the Operational Programme Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014-2020 was secured in period 2018-2020. Most relevant are projects "Development of the management framework for ecological network Natura 2000" and project "Development of National Species and Habitats

Monitoring System". Also, in the framework of the Rural Development Program 2014-2020 a voluntary scheme for Corncrake ("Pilot - agri-environmental measure for Corncrake") was established. This scheme is applicable throughout the range of the Corncrake to encourage delayed mowing and subsidies are payed to farmers for such practice. Further more, several educational and informational activities relevant for waterbirds were conducted and financed from national budget by public institutions responsible for management of national/nature parks and ecological network Natura 2000.

98.2 Does your country's government have unpaid dues to the AEWA Trust Fund (annual assessed contributions to the Agreement's budget as approved by each session of the Meeting of the Parties)?

No

98.3 Has your country's government provided funding to support developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, to meet their obligations under AEWA, and the implementation of the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa 2019-2027? Under this question please report for support provided outside of formal and established intergovernmental cooperation. For the latter, please refer to the next question 98.4.

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Donation or other financial support was not done due to limited financial resources in period 2018-2020, as well as due to the COVID-19 crisis.

98.4 Does your country's government participate in any South-South, North-South or triangular cooperation to enhance financial and technical support for the successful implementation of AEWA activities?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of human and financial resources.

98.5 Does your country's government use innovative financing mechanisms for implementing the AEWA Strategic Plan such as a (national) Migratory Waterbirds Fund?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> Lack of human resources.

98.6 Does the implementation of AEWA in your country benefit from synergies between biodiversity-related conventions at national level, amongst others, through information sharing on potential funding opportunities and sharing of financial resources such as the Desertification Fund, Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Fund, and the Global Environmental Facility?

No

Please explain the reasons

>>> In the reporting period no actions relevant for AEWA were financed using the Green Climate Fund or Adaptation Fund. Croatia is no more eligible for projects financed from the Global Environmental Facility.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 9. Implementation

>>> No additional information

Pressures and Responses

10. Climate Change

99. Please outline relevant climate change research, assessments and/or adaptation measures that are relevant to migratory waterbirds and which have been undertaken or planned in your country. (Resolution 5.13)

a. Research and studies of climate change impacts on waterbirds

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> Up to now no such research was undertaken. Bird species listed in the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change do not occur in the Republic of Croatia

b. Assessment of the potential vulnerability to climate change of key habitats used by waterbird species (including those outside protected area networks) (Please note that the question asks about habitats, rather than sites. Question 41 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates vulnerability of sites to climate change)

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> As stated above, bird species listed in the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change do not occur in the Republic of Croatia, For that reason habitats used by waterbird species in Croatia are not yet recognized as potentially vulnerable to climate change.

c. Assessment of the potential vulnerability of waterbird species to climate change.

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> As explained above

d. Review of relevant national conservation policies relevant to waterbirds and climate change.

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> As explained above

e. National Action Plan for helping waterbirds adapt to climate change (as a separate implementation process or as part of a larger national framework for biodiversity adaptation to climate change. Please note that Question 42 in Section 5, sub-section 5.2 investigates national measures for increasing resilience of the ecological network for waterbirds to climate change).

No relevant activities

Please explain the reasons

>>> As explained above

f. Other undertaken or planned relevant activities.

No

100. Has your country used the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change?

Notice: Before clicking on the above hyperlink, please keep pressing the Ctrl button on your keyboard to open the link in a new tab.

Not applicable

Please explain

>>> Bird species listed in the AEWA Conservation Guidelines on measures needed to help waterbirds to adapt to climate change do not occur in the Republic of Croatia.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 10. Climate Change

>>> There is no additional information.

Pressures and Responses

11. Avian Influenza

101. What issues have proved challenging in responding nationally to the spread of the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in the last triennium and what further guidance or information would be useful in this respect?

List challenges

>>> None

List required further guidance or information

>>> None

Field for additional information (optional)

>>> During 2019 and 2020 no HPAI viruses were detected in wild birds. In 2021 (until March 12) HPAI H5N8 virus was detected in two dead mute swans found at the same location in Vukovar-Srijem County. There is a national program for detection of avian influenza viruses in wild birds since 2005. The program is laid down by the State veterinary administration and conducted by the Poultry Centre of the Croatian Veterinary Institute in collaboration with ornithologists. A total of 159 and 42 wild birds were tested for HPAI in 2019 and 2020, respectively. The tested birds were of 34 different species.

Optionally you can provide additional information on section 11. Avian Influenza

>>> No additional information

12. Confirmation

Confirmation of information verification and approval for submission

Please confirm:

In addition a scanned copy of an official letter from the relevant state institution, approving the report for submission, can be attached.

I declare that the information provided in the Report on the implementation of AEWA for the period 2018-2020 has been verified and the report has been approved for submission by the appropriate state institution in the country.

You have attached the following documents to this answer.

[HR_confirmation_letter_NR_2018-2020.pdf](#) - Confirmation letter

Date of submission

>>> 7.4.2021